

## **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for notice that claims 2-13, 22 and 23 are allowed.

Applicants also wish to thank the Examiner for the statements made in the “Response to Arguments” section attempting to address Applicants’ previous remarks. However, it appears that the claim language and may have been misapprehended. Accordingly, as set forth below, the other pending claims are also in condition for allowance.

Claims 25 is objected to due to an informality. Applicants however respectfully submit that if the insertion of the letter “a” is done as suggested it appears that this would be grammatically incorrect. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Claims 4-16 and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheney in view of So. Applicants respectfully submit that the “response to arguments” section regarding these claims rejects them on an improper basis by adding language to the claim which does not exist. For example, on page 2 of the final action it is stated “the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicants because given the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims, the scope of the claimed ‘compressed transport data’ could be considered ‘previously compressed transport st[r]eam data’ stored in the memory as disclosed in the Cheney reference as described above.” The rejection now inserts the word ‘previously’ into the claims which changes the claims to mean uncompressed transport data stream which is not what is claimed. The claims require a compressed transport stream, a portion of which is stored via a first bus in a memory buffer controlled by the secondary set of control signals and the memory buffer comprises a frame buffer that stores uncompressed data in a different mode of operation. As previously noted and as apparently recognized by the Examiner, the Cheney reference only

teaches a system that employs frame buffers that store decoded video data – not compressed video data – in the frame buffer memory. This is specifically spelled out in the Cheney reference and Applicants respectfully submit that it is improper to modify applicants claims in an effort to render them unpatentable. Applicants also respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made in a previous response. As such, since Cheney does not teach the alleged subject matter and the claims are in condition for allowance.

Cheney teaches a system that employs frame buffers that store decoded video data in a full frame format or a combination of decoded full frame format and scaled decoded video for output to a display as noted, for example, in column 9, lines 26-31. Also, column 9, lines 31-54 specifically state that the encoded streams which is a coded MPEG-2 video data is “fed through memory control unit 652 as coded MPEG-2 video data to the input of video decoder 654.” (emphasis added). As such, Cheney teaches that the encoded or compressed video data goes to the video decoder 654 through the memory controller 652 and not into the frame buffer until it is decoded. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Cheney reference does not teach what is alleged and accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance.

New Claim 26 is also believed to be allowable since the title references do not appear to teach or suggest this claim’s subject matter.

The dependant claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

As to claim 25, the Examiner reasserted the relevant remarks made with respect to claim 14. As such, Applicants respectfully reassert the remarks made above with respect to claim 14 and as such, this claim is also in condition for allowance.

Claims 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schindler in view of So. Claim 18 like Claim 14 and others requires, among other things that the

video graphics adapter stores a portion of the compressed transport stream data signals in the frame buffer memory controlled by a secondary set of control signals from the compressed transport stream control signals and stores uncompressed data in the frame buffer memory in a different mode of operation. The office action does not appear to address this language and it does not appear to be taught or suggested in the cited references as such these claims are also in condition for allowance.

To the extent necessary, Applicant also restates relevant remarks from their previous response.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schindler in view of Malladi et al. and in further view of Datari. Claim 21 requires, among other things, storing pixel information in a frame buffer of a video graphics adapter wherein one line of frame buffer memory is representative of one line of video image to be displayed and in the second mode of operation stores compressed transport stream data wherein one line of the frame buffer memory is representative of one transport stream packet.

The motivation used to reject the claims must be relevant to Applicants' claimed invention. The motivation is not relevant to Applicants' device. As such, one would not use such motivation to combine references and as such, the references are not combinable as alleged. In any event, as noted above, the references when analyzed for their actual teaching as noted above, do not teach what is alleged in the office action and as such, the claims are in condition for allowance.

The dependant claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the

below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

By:           /Christopher J. Reckamp/            
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Registration No. 34,414

Date: October 31, 2007

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2600  
Chicago, IL 60601  
(312) 609-7500  
FAX: (312) 609-5005